

Canadian Studies by Mr. Symons and Mr. Page. I turn to page 77 of this report. This is just a small sample of the advice given to this Government. It reads as follows:

It is going to be difficult, however, to improve much further or faster on the state of teaching and research about Canada because of the human resource problems that at present plague Canadian universities. These difficulties are compounded by the acute financial problems faced by our universities.

That is a 1984 report, Mr. Speaker. Let me go back to 1983. We have a report to the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) by the skill development leave task force. Again, let me quote just a small portion from that report advising the Government. At page 19 we find this:

"Lack of appropriate education response restricts Canadian growth potential."

The insufficient investment of resources in training and education and the often inappropriate nature of existing programs have been a brake on Canadian industrial production, flexibility and ability to reach employment goals.

That report of 1983 was directed at the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

One of the first assignments I accepted in this new Parliament in 1980 was to act as co-chairman of a specially created parliamentary task force made up of seven members from all three Parties. We spent 14 months touring Canada, listening to witnesses who came before us. The advice given was consistent: education was rapidly approaching a crisis point when it came to funding. We prepared a report for this Parliament. Many, many recommendations dealt with the issue of funding—how to provide more funding for the system, government funding in some cases and private sector funding in other cases. That report was preceded by another special parliamentary task force that dealt specifically with the issue of the transfer of funds from the federal Government to the provinces for the purposes of education and health. The thrust of that report was to increase funding and not to decrease it. Every report in the four years of this Parliament has been consistent in its advice to this Cabinet that more resources are required for education, not less.

The consistent action on the part of this Cabinet, supported by its back-benchers—Liberal Members—is to move in the direction of cutting funding. The advice is to increase; the action is to cut. I think every Liberal Member of Parliament who supports ignoring the consistency of that advice should hang his or her head in shame. Liberal Members of Parliament should be unwilling to go back to their ridings and speak publicly in any kind of positive way about the actions of the Cabinet which they support.

Educational projections tell us that in post-secondary education in Canada the most likely scenario for the next four years is an increase in enrolment of 6.6 per cent. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) tells us that maybe we will be lucky and will have inflation below 5 per cent. An increase in enrolment of 6.6 per cent and an inflation rate of 5 per cent produces in post-secondary education, just to hold the line, a need for 12 per cent more funding for each and every year for the next four years.

We have a piece of legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker, that cuts funding and takes it below 5 per cent. This is in the

### *Established Programs Financing*

face of a 12 per cent need just to hold the line and at a time when institutions are already in an acute financial crisis. Yet we are expected to stand in this chamber and vote for a piece of legislation that will make worse the severe financial situation in which post-secondary educational institutions already find themselves. That is insanity.

If you look into the public accounts of Canada, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the Government of Canada intends this year to give an additional \$400 million to one corporation. That corporation is Petro-Canada. The Government says the priority use of public funds is to put them into the hands of an arm's length organization so as to do a couple of things—to buy some service stations and gas pumps and to buy a lot more advertising. The Cabinet says that \$400 million spent in that way is necessary. Therefore, the Government will cut \$380 million from the post-secondary institutions. That is insanity. It is counter-productive. It defies any sense of logic or reason which any rational human being would bring to Canada.

Do we need university professors, desks, educational opportunities, or do we need the Government of Canada buying service stations and putting ads on TV saying buy our gas instead of the other guy's? This is an insane world. In 16 days this Government will have been in office four years. The Canadian tradition says: "Let's go public; let's debate the issues; let's have an election". Let us see if this Government is insane and we are rational or the other way around. The voters of this country deserve the chance to make that decision and they deserve the chance to make it quickly. It is time for the Government to resign. I say, call an election. Let us debate the future of this country and get on with the job of building a future for our young people as quickly as we can.

• (1200)

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this abbreviated part of the debate this morning. At this stage we are allowed only ten minutes to put our remarks in *Hansard* or on the public record.

Bill C-12 is really a very regressive kind of Bill in some respects. I do not think the Government fully recognizes the regressive aspects of it. By imposing a six and five formula on post-secondary institutions in Canada, we are effectively not only slowing down the growth of those institutions but in some cases are chopping them very badly.

Basically the Bill separates health care funding to the provinces or transfer of payments from post-secondary education funding. I suppose that is the only good thing I can say about the Bill at this time. At least we know in total terms how much is going to health care and how much is going to education, whereas before it was strictly block funding under this legislation. However, it limits transfers for 1983-84 to 6 per cent and for 1984-85 to 5 per cent. In a sense we are debating a retroactive Bill as the impact and import of it have been in effect since April 1, 1983.

Let us take a look at the effect it will have on universities, as far as the six and five is concerned, with respect to the transfer of payments. Let there be no mistake about it, the six